

ITEMS

VOLUME 6 • NUMBER 1 • MARCH 1952
230 PARK AVENUE • NEW YORK 17, N. Y.

FIRST STEPS TOWARD AN INTERNATIONAL SOCIAL SCIENCE COUNCIL

by Donald Young

A "Consultative Meeting of Experts on the Question of an International Social Science Council" held in Paris over the four-day period from December 18 to 21, 1951, unanimously recommended that such an organization be promptly established. The meeting was called by Mme. Alva Myrdal as Director of the Department of Social Sciences of UNESCO, and was in accordance with the action of the Sixth General Conference of UNESCO in Paris in June-July 1951 authorizing the Director-General, Dr. Jaime Torres Bodet, "To proceed as soon as practicable, with the help of the competent International Organizations, to establish an International Social Science Research Council . . ." (Resolution 3.17).

The December meeting was attended by eighteen social scientists invited as consultants,¹ eight observers representing interested international organizations, and those members of the UNESCO secretariat most concerned with the matter under discussion. The eighteen

invited participants came from ten countries and represented six social disciplines: economics, political science, sociology, social psychology, anthropology, and comparative law. Despite the diversity of nationalities and disciplines represented, unanimous agreement was readily reached not only on the need for an international social science council, but also on the scope of its initial functions and on the form of organization which would be most suitable at least in the early stage of operation.

Perhaps the fundamental reason for the remarkable unanimity developed in the meeting was the recognition by all the participants of the inherently international character of science and scholarship. The unquestioning acceptance of this fact inevitably led to the conclusion that an international organization such as the proposed council should be helpful in advancing the social sciences on a truly international basis. The examples of the existing councils in the natural sciences and the humanities, the International Council of Scientific Unions and the International Council for Philosophy and Humanistic Studies, gave practical evidence of the utility of interdisciplinary international organization and emphasized the need for a parallel agency in the social sciences.

Although the Director-General of UNESCO was authorized by the General Conference to establish an "International Social Science Research Council," the recommendations of the consultative meeting in Paris purposefully refer to the proposed organization as an "International Social Science Council." The suggested change in name is a consequence of agreement that while the first objective of the contemplated council should be

¹ The social scientists invited to attend as consultants were: Vilhelm Aubert, Norwegian National Council for Scientific Research and University of Oslo; Arvid Brodersen (rapporteur), New School for Social Research; Hans Döller, University of Tübingen; Léon-H. Dupriez, Institute of Economic and Social Research, University of Louvain; Maurice Duverger, Universities of Bordeaux and of Paris; J. C. Falardeau, Canadian Social Science Research Council and Laval University; Gunnar Heckscher, Swedish National Research Council and University of Stockholm; G. Jamati, National Center for Scientific Research, Paris; Otto Klineberg, Columbia University; Claude Lévi-Strauss, Institute for Advanced Studies, University of Paris; Jean Meynaud, Coordination Committee on Documentation in the Social Sciences, Paris; Peter H. Odegard, University of California, Berkeley; O. A. Oeser, Australian National Research Council and University of Melbourne; E. A. G. Robinson, National Institute for Economic and Social Research, London; Francesco Vito, University of the Sacred Heart, Milan; J. Willems, National Foundation for Scientific Research, Brussels; Louis Wirth (chairman), University of Chicago; Donald Young, Social Science Research Council and Russell Sage Foundation.

the advancement of research, attention would have to be given also to teaching and training in the social sciences, and that the council should be free to aid as well in the application of social science knowledge to practical affairs. The broad scope suggested by eliminating the word "research" from the name of the council was intended to provide flexibility in operation. Discussion throughout the meeting stressed research as the dominating concern of the council, and the unanimously adopted recommendations on objectives, functions, and activities support this interpretation of the intent of the consultative group. These recommendations are here quoted in full:

It is recommended:

1. That an International Social Science Council should be established with the primary purpose of advancing social science throughout the world; its secondary purpose should be to bring to bear the knowledge, methods and skills of the social sciences upon the major problems of our times;
2. That the Council should be an autonomous body with its own secretariat;
3. That in the view of this Committee of Experts, the Council should begin with modest initial objectives;
4. That among its duties should be the following:
 - (a) To advise the United Nations and its Specialized Agencies on any question on which its advice is asked for;
 - (b) Whenever the Council deems it appropriate, to tender service to UNESCO on its own initiative;
 - (c) To recommend specific projects of interdisciplinary research to competent international or national bodies;
 - (d) Whenever asked to do so, to tender advice to competent international or national bodies on proposed projects of research;
 - (e) Whenever asked to do so, to tender advice on the choice of suitable scientists for interdisciplinary projects of research;
5. That the Council should, if and when funds are available, be free to sponsor specific projects of interdisciplinary research under the guidance of subcommittees created *ad hoc* by the Council;
6. That in the performance of these duties, the Council should not concern itself with the relations between United Nations agencies and the international associations in the several disciplines, nor with the internal organization of individual universities;
7. That, in its independent activities, the Council should, at least to begin with, limit itself to questions of research of an interdisciplinary character;
8. That the Council should not assume any duties for which another competent body exists.²

² Arvid Brodersen, "Report on the Consultative Meeting of Experts on the Question of an International Social Science Council, Paris, 18-21 December 1951" (manuscript copy of the rapporteur's summary of the discussions and actions at the meeting), pp. 5-6.

The fourth recommendation quoted above may give the impression that the council is intended to be charged with providing advisory services on a somewhat grandiose scale, but it should be noted that in three of the five specified occasions for giving advice it is to be supplied only on invitation. An agency which is expected to receive financial aid from UNESCO could hardly do less than stand ready to be of assistance when asked. When the eight recommendations are read as a whole, the emphasis on a modest beginning is indeed evident. The hope is, of course, that limited initial efforts may prove the worth of an International Social Science Council and lead to expansion on the basis of achievements rather than of wishful thinking.

The recommendations on structure and organization of the council also provide for an unassuming beginning, in the belief that the desired autonomous agency must not be hampered at the start by inflexible limitations but must be free to develop in form and manner of operation in accordance with the judgment of its members. The Paris consultative meeting consequently adopted the following resolution:

It is recommended:

1. That the Council should be a body of social scientists active or interested in interdisciplinary research, and concerned with the advancement of social science as a whole throughout the world;
2. That members of the Council should serve in their individual capacities, and not as representatives or delegates of associations, institutions or countries;
3. That members should be chosen with a view to incorporating in the Council the skills and orientations of the various disciplines, as well as the personal qualities of leadership and statesmanship;
4. That the Council, at least for the first three years, should consist of not more than fifteen members, not more than ten to be chosen in consultation with international associations in central fields of the social sciences, not more than five to be chosen as members-at-large with due consideration for disciplines and interests not otherwise represented;
5. That the term of office should be two years; no member should serve more than three consecutive terms;
6. That ten members should be elected by the Council from panels of at least six names submitted by each of the international associations referred to in item 4 above, and that members-at-large should be elected by the Council in such manner as it may determine;
7. That, for the purpose of initiating the Council, the Director of the Department of Social Sciences of UNESCO and three other independent persons of high academic standing in the social sciences, to be selected in consultation with the international associations referred to above, should appoint the members of the Council for the first term, according to the principles in item 4 above; not more than two-thirds of

the members so appointed should be eligible for immediate re-election;

8. That the Council should choose its own officers and draw up its own Charter and Bylaws in general accordance with the proposed organization and functions set out above. If in the view of the Council it is desirable to modify essentially its organization or functions it shall first consult with the international associations referred to above.³

In all probability the proposed council will be established within the year, and it may be regarded as certain that the recommendations of the consultative meeting will be most influential in the formative period. With the creation of the council now practically assured, attention must be turned from initial considerations to problems of development.

Since there is little likelihood that in the near future the council will have the facilities to attract a large staff or operate more than a very few projects of its own—and there is no thought that it should do so, at least for the present—a major problem will be the development of working relationships with social science agencies and individual social scientists concerned with interdisciplinary and international research, in whatever part of the world they may be found. The necessity for such working relationships was recognized at the consultative meeting by the adoption of the recommendation

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 9-10.

that the Council should maintain cooperative relations with international associations in the various branches of social science; with international councils in the other scientific and humanistic disciplines, especially the Council for Philosophy and Humanistic Studies (CIPSH) and the International Council of Scientific Unions (ICSU); and with national bodies (research councils, academies, institutes, etc.) concerned with the social sciences on a multidisciplinary basis.⁴

Such cooperation with other agencies and individuals cannot be expected to result from mere expressions of intention, but is dependent on the quality of the members of the council and their devotion to its purposes, on the skill of the staff, and on reasonable financing. There are grounds for long-run optimism on all three points, although there is the discouraging prospect of an initial grant from UNESCO much smaller than desirable for a good beginning. Even so, a start is being made at a time when the opportunities and need for cooperation in interdisciplinary and international research on problems of human relations are so evident that it may be anticipated that a variety of financial sources will be available provided that the utility of the council is demonstrated in its first two or three years of operation.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 7.

RESEARCH IN CROSS-CULTURAL EDUCATION

by Wendell C. Bennett

THE phrase "exchange of persons" is now used to cover a multitude of activities. Every year thousands of foreign nationals come to this country under United States government grants, with support from their own governments, with fellowships from a wide variety of private institutions and organizations, or without any outside aid. In like manner thousands of our own citizens travel abroad as tourists, scholars, businessmen, or government employees. In effect, exchange of persons has become a standard technique for all large-scale international programs whether their basic objectives be the spreading of good will, the extension of technological aid, or any other.

THE FIELD

Within the total field of exchange of persons, the student category is a significant one. There are, unfortunately, no accurate statistics on the magnitude of the exchange programs, and even the figures on the numbers

of foreign students who attend United States educational institutions are not complete. The Institute of International Education in its annual census of foreign students in the United States for 1949-50 gives a total of 26,433 of whom 50 percent were undergraduates, 33 percent graduates, and the rest special students. Approximately 36 percent of all these received special types of financial assistance, but less than 10 percent were actually sponsored by officially organized programs. There is every indication, however, that the total number of students is increasing and that the official programs are expanding.

That the phenomenon of students studying at universities in countries other than their own is not a recent one, is clearly shown in a report on the history of cross-cultural education, prepared for the Social Science Research Council by Guy Metraux. By the middle of the twelfth century students were traveling from one country to another in the search for distinguished teachers and outstanding books. Cross-cultural education

was, at that time, essentially a means of acquiring and diffusing knowledge. In the sixteenth century a new motive appeared, namely the desire to complete a liberal education by foreign travel and educational experience, which ultimately resulted in the gentlemanly concept of the "grand tour." It was not, however, until the end of the nineteenth century that education in a foreign country was also considered to be a means of achieving mutual understanding on the international level, and not until after the First World War that student exchange was used as a means to effect certain objectives of foreign policy. Thus student exchange in general is an ancient practice, virtually an institution in Western civilization, although the motives have multiplied throughout the years; but exchanges on a large-scale organized basis are a relatively recent development.

The extent to which exchanges, student and other, have become formally organized has been analyzed for the Social Science Research Council by W. Rex Crawford. His analysis covers the numerous agencies of the United States government now engaged in operating exchange programs, as well as the activities of other governments, foundations, and special organizations. He shows the great variety of motivations and goals involved in these many programs, and the different ways in which the exchange aspects are administered.

Today, then, exchange of persons has become so complex and involved that it can no longer be considered a field for investigation in itself, but is at best a technique, loosely and variously defined, employed by many different programs for many different purposes. Even the student's role in the programs has become so multidimensional that it can scarcely be studied as a whole.

THE PROBLEMS

The wide acceptance of the technique of exchange of persons in international relations programs, and the large number of individuals now involved in these programs raise numerous problems of interest to social scientists and administrators alike. Many of these were brought out at two conferences sponsored by the Social Science Research Council in the fall of 1951. The participants represented government agencies, foundations, area specialists, social scientists, and others concerned both practically and theoretically with exchange programs. The discussions covered an enormous range of topics, reflecting the complexity of the field, but three major categories of interests and accompanying problems could be discerned, namely policy, administration, and research, although obviously these three are by no means mutually exclusive.

Those interested in policy problems are concerned

with the appropriateness of the use of exchange techniques in terms of the stated goals of a program. If, for example, a program is intended to aid in the technological development of a country, should its nationals be brought to the United States for training; and if so, which ones, for what kind of training, where, and for how long? Such practical questions raise even broader ones about the validity of the assumptions which underlie the use of the exchange techniques. For example, Crawford in the analysis mentioned above summarizes the assumptions which in his view underlie the technical aid programs: "That the United States as a center of technology has much to offer to the less developed countries of the world; that exchange of persons can give to individuals technical knowledge which they may later apply to the benefit of their countries; [furthermore] that technological development will contribute to a high standard of living which will, in turn, contribute to the stability of the world." It is self-evident that an evaluation of policy problems of this magnitude would involve much more than the study of exchange of persons.

Those interested in administrative problems raise questions of a more practical nature. Granting that exchange is being carried out on a large scale, how can it be most effectively executed? In order to answer this question examination of the selection of individuals for exchange, their programs in this country, their supervision, and various other aspects, is required. What is now being done? Is it satisfactory? Could it be improved? These are the types of questions presented. Actually, many studies directed toward evaluation of the execution of programs are now being carried out by the agencies themselves and by other interested persons.

Those with research interests state the problem somewhat differently. The exchange programs, whatever their motivations, are bringing thousands of individuals from many parts of the world to the United States, and in turn sending thousands of our own citizens elsewhere. What is the effect of this large-scale experiment in cross-cultural experience? How important are cultural background factors in aiding or blocking an individual's adjustment to another country? What types of experience can be transferred? How are attitudes affected, and how significant are the changes? The number of research queries which the exchange situation raises is myriad.

The process of exchange of persons thus presents numerous problems involving research and evaluation. While much can be learned from general surveys and from the practical experience of those operating exchange programs, effective evaluation must ultimately be based on sound research. The existing literature on the over-all field of exchange of persons is extensive, but contains few reports of significant research.

A RESEARCH APPROACH

The Social Science Research Council has recently established a Committee on Cross-Cultural Education¹ to review the field of exchange of persons and to outline a research program. At the outset it was recognized that a project concerned with the whole field of exchange of persons would be too large an undertaking because of the wide scope and variety of the programs and the multitude of variables involved. Consequently, the range of the study was first limited to the exchange of students.

Even the study of student exchange programs would require definitions of the aims which they are intended to further. Such aims might include the fostering of general or of technical education, the promotion of cultural understanding, and the advancement of democratic ideals. It cannot be assumed that formal education is the most effective way of achieving all these purposes, or that the American conception of education is universally held.

For example, it might be presumed that it is desirable to bring foreign students to the United States to further their general or their technical education. However, such a presumption may not apply with equal validity to students from all cultures. In some countries the prestige value of an education is low; it may be, therefore, that young men from that area should not be expected to be interested in following a course of study at an American university and that, if they are to be brought to the United States for other reasons, they should not be expected to become members of a student body. There is evidence that, when sending their sons abroad, wealthy families in some countries have in mind an experience approximating a "grand tour" rather than the securing of a degree. On the other hand, Japanese students coming to the United States, for example, are often highly motivated toward obtaining advanced technical training. These considerations give rise to the hypothesis that there is no such person as "the foreign student" but that there are many different types of foreign students, and that the programs through which they are brought to the United States should have various expectations and should provide different types of experience. Whatever the aim or combination of aims behind an exchange program, we must know more than we know at present about the background and experience of the students concerned.

The presence in this country of some 30,000 foreign

students from numerous and diverse cultural backgrounds provides a laboratory for the firsthand study of cross-cultural contacts under semicontrolled conditions. To date, this research resource has not been exploited. While some attention has been paid to certain aspects of the experiences of exchanges and to the products of these experiences, such as the acquisition of new skills or changes in attitudes, little research has been done on the experiences of individual foreign students. Moreover, previous studies have generally been of the survey variety and have given little attention to important, even crucial, cultural variables.

The research approach proposed by the Council's committee is that intensive studies be made of the reaction, adjustment, and adaptation of foreign students to American culture and university life. For research purposes of course the field must be delimited. Consequently, the project is initially concerned with the study of foreign students in universities in the United States. A detailed study of the factors affecting the behavior, attitudes, and achievements of these foreign students would not only be important in itself but should also furnish leads for the evaluation of the over-all exchange programs of which the students are a part.

The basic concept in this approach is that generalizations about the experience of foreign students and the significant variables which affect that experience are not possible until we have detailed knowledge of the experience of particular individuals from specific countries in American universities. For analytical purposes the American university may be considered a constant, but "foreign students" cannot be so defined since we know that they come from many different cultural backgrounds and with widely varied academic preparation and motivations. Consequently, the initial study will be limited to foreign students from particular countries, selected on the basis of their cultural contrasts to each other and to the United States, particularly to the university environment in this country.

For the first year, samples from three countries could be studied. From the findings about these it can be determined whether additional country samples are needed, whether continued study of the initial three is required, or whether the approach should be shifted to the examination of noncultural factors.

The first stage in the study will involve interviews, observations, and examination of the records of selected students from three countries. This could be called the "intensive" study. Twenty students from each country, located at two different universities, are considered to be the minimum requirement. An emphasis will be placed on the cultural background. An area specialist, working with the interviewer, will indicate the cultural

¹ The members are Wendell C. Bennett, Yale University (chairman); W. Rex Crawford, University of Pennsylvania; Cora Du Bois, Institute of International Education; Herbert Hyman, Columbia University; Ronald Lippitt, University of Michigan; Charles P. Loomis, Michigan State College; staff, Joseph B. Casagrande and Bryce Wood.

factors which might be significant, and these will be tested in the studies of the students themselves. The purpose of this procedure is to determine the importance of the cultural background in the student's adjustment to the United States, in contrast to other known factors. The intensive study will not be limited to the cultural background but will endeavor to cover all facets of the student's experience and reactions.

The second stage in the study will be an "extensive" survey of a larger number of students from the selected countries, based on diagnostics and leads obtained in the intensive study. This survey will be carried out by questionnaires or brief interviews.

The third stage will involve examination or study of other materials and situations pertinent to understanding of the experience of the students. This stage will vary in terms of the particular country but will include study of nationals in noneducational settings, such as the program of training for agriculture, the experience of professional persons from the country now resident in the United States, review of literature on immigrant groups, and the like. The attention given to the study of leaders, professional personnel, those enrolled in training programs, and other nonstudent groups must depend largely upon practical considerations, such as the length of their visits and suitable relations with such visitors during their stay in the United States.

The approach, then, is threefold: intensive study of selected students from particular countries, extension to a large sample by survey and polling, and control through review of related material. The results should furnish leads, if not conclusions, concerning the importance of cultural background factors in the students' adjustments and achievements and also should suggest other variables of importance, such as economic and social status both at home and in the United States, the importance of academic preparation before coming to this country, and other factors in the university environment.

The first part of the program is expected to yield a series of reports on the experience of students from the three countries and their problems of adjustment to the American universities. These particular studies should form the basis for broader generalizations. In order to achieve this, it is of great importance that the intensive studies be so organized that their findings are comparable. This will be done in part by setting up comparable schedules for the area background reports, for the minimum types of factual information gathered for each student, for the interviews, and for the extensive surveys. Further uniformity in the studies will be gained through conferences of the various directors and through the committee and staff.

The ultimate goal of this research project is the formulation of some basic generalizations about foreign students in the United States, as one aspect of the broader program of international exchange. Comparisons among the findings for the specific countries will be the principal basis for this. However, other types of studies will also be required for the broader interpretations. For example, we may have to re-examine the assumption that the American university is a constant. We should review the literature on the problems of adjustment of our own students to the universities. We should appraise the experience of foreign student advisers, seek the opinions of outstanding foreigners in this country, and review the pertinent literature, not only on exchange programs but from relevant branches of social science. The number and kinds of such related studies which will be needed of course cannot be specifically determined in advance.

It is proposed that the project extend over a three-year period. This is desirable for several reasons. Some aspects of the program run in sequence: for example, the extensive surveys must follow the intensive interviews. Some parts of the program depend on the availability of specialists, and a three-year period gives greater opportunity of finding the persons best suited for each task. Most important of all is the dependence of new research on the findings of the initial part of the program. Little pertinent study has been made of student exchange thus far, so that it is difficult to predict at this point what direction the study will take in its second year. The factor of flexibility is, in this case, an advantage in developing the research plans.

Logically, the second part of the program should be a study of the behavior and attitudes of students in their home countries following their educational experience in the United States. The committee is now considering a project of this kind which, while complementary, requires a quite different approach. For example, comparisons should be made of the students educated in this country and those educated at home, or in other countries. While it might be desirable to follow specific students who had been subjects of the committee's study in the United States, it would also be necessary to include others who had studied here at earlier time periods. The two parts of the program should probably be matched closely, for example, by selection of the same countries, by use of some of the same interview schedules, and even by utilizing the same interviewers.

The committee considers this program to be but one research approach to the study of exchange of persons. It hopes, in fact, that the outline of one program may inspire others and focus interest on the research opportunities in this field.

INTERUNIVERSITY SUMMER RESEARCH SEMINARS, 1952

FIVE interuniversity summer research seminars will be held during July and August 1952, under the three-year program initiated by the Council in the summer of 1950 with support provided by the John and Mary R. Markle Foundation. The seminars are designed to aid outstanding social science research workers in the 30- to 40-year age group who might otherwise be financially unable to further their research interests during the summer vacation period. In judging proposals for seminars to be held under this program primary consideration is given to identifying a particular group whose intellectual development and competence in research will assure optimum use of two months of intensive work on a problem of common scientific concern. The importance of the topic proposed for research planning and appraisal is also considered.

COMPARATIVE POLITICS

An eight-week seminar on comparative politics will be held at Northwestern University beginning July 1, under the chairmanship of Roy C. Macridis, who describes the seminar as follows:

"The organization of an interuniversity summer research seminar on comparative politics reflects an interest in a critical appraisal of the traditional country by country approach used currently in the study of comparative government. The seminar will devote its time to a study of comprehensive concepts that transcend individual governmental structures. Its purpose will be primarily that of developing a more fruitful methodological approach. The findings and methods of other social sciences will be examined and their bearing upon the study of comparative politics assessed.

"It is expected that the group will devote at least two weeks to discussion of the method of political science. Two more weeks will be devoted to study of the value of the comparative method with an effort to devise broad conceptual schemes under which the comparative study of political phenomena will become more meaningful. The members of the seminar are of the opinion that broader concepts such as decision making, communication and control patterns, the representative process, consent, political stability, revolution, etc. can supplement and in certain aspects replace the traditional topics of comparative government, i.e., the executive, the legislature, constitutions, administration, etc.

"The remaining time will be devoted to testing some of the comprehensive hypotheses evolved through an examination of various political systems. The participants hope that the results of their work may be incorporated in a small volume on the method of comparative politics.

"The prospective participants are: Samuel H. Beer and Harry Eckstein of Harvard University; George I. Blanksten and Roy C. Macridis of Northwestern; Karl W. Deutsch, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Kenneth W. Thompson, University of Chicago; and Robert E. Ward, University of Michigan."

CULTURAL INTERCHANGE

Under the chairmanship of Franklin Scott a seminar on cultural interchange will meet at Northwestern University from June 23 to mid-August. Mr. Scott has outlined the project as follows:

"The members of the group come from the fields of history, sociology, and anthropology, and include Kendall A. Birr of the University of California at Berkeley, George Gilkey of Westminster College (Utah), Theodore Saloutos of the University of California at Los Angeles, Franklin Scott of Northwestern, and Kurt Wolff of Ohio State University. Plans have been made to draw in for consultation Merle Curti of the University of Wisconsin, Richard H. Heindel of the Department of State, and Melville J. Herskovits and William R. Bascom of Northwestern.

"Each of the seminar members involved has already under way a project which will be further developed during the summer by individual research and group criticism. All the projects are concerned with the broad theme of American influences abroad, and most are related to the question of the impact of emigration on different parts of Europe. Since little has been done to establish common standards or techniques in this field of research, it is expected that discussion and mutual criticism will enhance the value of these studies.

"Beyond the work on particular topics the members are interested in the problems and potentialities of cultural interchange study as a whole. By correspondence they have compiled a list of problems in this broad field of study. They are in process of narrowing that list in order that they may deal constructively with a few general problems. One of these will probably be the preparation of a bibliography of studies of cultural interchange; another will probably be an attempt to determine the areas (such as technology, religion, political ideas, literature) in which study of cultural influences can be best evaluated and most fruitful."

FAMILY RESEARCH

Anselm L. Strauss, who will serve as chairman of the seminar on family research at the University of Colorado, has provided the following statement of its plans:

"A summer seminar composed of anthropologists, sociologists, and a psychologist will meet from June 15 to August 15 to discuss family research, with particular reference to the emergence of values and roles. The participants are: Nelson N. Foote, University of Chicago; Oscar Lewis, University of Illinois; Daniel R. Miller, University of Michigan; Edward L. Rose, University of Colorado; Melford E. Spiro, Washington University; Anselm L. Strauss, Indiana University; and Guy E. Swanson, University of Michigan.

"The seminar has been organized with the intent of examining and relating to family investigation the main streams of theory about individual and group behavior. The meetings will begin with presentations and discussion of a series of theories of development, each focusing upon critical redefinitions of roles and self-identifications: Erikson, Sullivan, Baldwin, Piaget, and others. Following this, each participant will present for discussion and criticism research on which he is currently engaged. Areas that will be discussed include role development in children, symbolic mechanisms as taught by parents and as reactions to parents, development of empathy and identifications, and so on. Certain memoranda submitted to the Council's Committee on Family Research, to which Foote contributed, will be discussed, as well as unpublished materials on Mexican and Palestinian families gathered respectively by Lewis and Spiro. There will be an evaluation of materials on such topics as family crisis, acculturation, and rites of passage. Differences and similarities of developmental analysis and structural-functional analysis, as they bear upon family investigation, will be outlined and explored. The latter general topic will probably be a major concern during the last half of the seminar period."

LEADERSHIP AND GROUP BEHAVIOR

Cecil A. Gibb has been coordinating plans for a seminar on leadership and group behavior, which he has described as follows:

"Dartmouth College will again be host to a summer research seminar during July and August. The participants will concern themselves with problems of leadership and small group behavior. Initial steps to set up this seminar were taken by Launor F. Carter of the University of Rochester, and under his chairmanship an interested group met in Chicago in September to formulate a program.

"Recognizing the complexity of group phenomena and the diverse approaches and theoretical positions represented by its members, this group decided that it would not be fruitful to anticipate the formulation of a generally acceptable comprehensive theory of group

behavior. However, it was thought that this should be given some consideration and that each member should evaluate his own research in relation to other research results and to some such theory of group behavior. To this end the seminar will try to identify, and order, the factual material in which it can place considerable faith, in the area of leadership, and such aspects of group behavior as should be considered in leadership problems. It will be the aim of this seminar to collate and evaluate that factual material which can be utilized in the development of theoretical formulations in this area.

"Procedurally, prior to the seminar dates, members of the group will prepare papers surveying and attempting to systematize known material. Topics already agreed upon for such treatment are: cohesiveness; leader succession; the development and assessment of leadership potential; personality variables and their relation to leadership and other group phenomena; and a comprehensive theory of group behavior which will subsume the leadership phenomena. Discussion of these papers will occupy the early weeks of the meetings, and it is then planned to attempt a systematization following some such scheme as the following: conceptualization of the phenomena; methodological considerations, i.e., rationales for leadership emergence and succession, the leadership process, and effectiveness of leadership; factors influencing the latter, i.e., personality variables, interaction variables, group and situational variables.

"Participants who represent the fields of psychology and sociology will include Bernard M. Bass, Louisiana State University; Alvin Gouldner, University of Buffalo; John K. Hemphill, Ohio State University; Ben Willerman, University of Minnesota; Cecil A. Gibb, an Australian at present teaching at Dartmouth; and, it is hoped, another sociologist."

SOCIAL INTEGRATION

Under the chairmanship of Robert C. Angell of the University of Michigan, a seminar on social integration will meet at Ann Arbor for eight weeks, starting in the last week of June. Werner S. Landecker, also of the University of Michigan, will serve as executive secretary of the group; he has described the seminar as follows:

"In addition to the chairman and secretary, the group will consist of the following sociologists: Albert K. Cohen, Indiana University; Walter Firey, University of Texas; William L. Kolb, Tulane University; and Albert J. Reiss, University of Chicago. Ernest W. Burgess, who will be on the summer faculty of the University of Michigan, will act as consultant.

"In a real sense the problem area with which the seminar will deal is central for the total field of sociology.

As the science of social groups, i.e., of wholes which are integrations of smaller units, sociology is committed to the study of the ties through which such integration takes place. It is a prime objective for sociological research, therefore, to understand the nature and varieties of these ties, the effects they exert on one another, the conditions by which they are strengthened or weakened, and the consequences of changes in their intensity. It seems that a large number of other problems which sociologists study are either more limited formulations within this problem area or are linked directly with it. Since social integration theory is so central, it has engaged the best minds of our discipline from the beginning. While in the early days such problems were dealt with largely in speculative terms, since about 1930 empirical studies have been accumulating which have reached conclusions in certain limited areas. The chief purpose of the seminar will be to promote the further and more systematic development of such research.

"The seminar will provide a meeting ground for persons who have approached problems of social integration

from different directions. Among the points of view represented are structural-functional theory linked with cultural analysis, the ecological frame of reference, the moral integration approach, and the interest of urban sociology in neighborhood and city patterns of integration. To incorporate all these orientations into the work of the seminar and to facilitate their interaction should contribute to the research utility of each. While a work schedule is still being developed in an exchange of ideas among the members, it might possibly be organized in such a manner that the following sequence of tasks can be undertaken: (1) analysis of different concrete situations in an attempt to examine the applicability of conceptual distinctions among dimensions of integration and to develop 'hunches' regarding the dynamics of integration; (2) theoretical expositions in which major areas for research are suggested; (3) the development of indices through which selected integration variables can be observed; (4) formulation of research hypotheses, and the discussion of designs for investigations which, it is hoped, will grow out of the proceedings of the seminar."

COMMITTEE BRIEFS

INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION AMONG SOCIAL SCIENTISTS

Roy F. Nichols (chairman), Robert C. Angell, Frederick S. Dunn, Robert B. Hall, Otto Klineberg, Donald Young; staff, Bryce Wood.

The Department of Social Sciences of UNESCO recently sought the Council's assistance in obtaining information about current research projects in the social sciences in the United States. The Institut Solvay, at Brussels, has compiled data for UNESCO with respect to research under way in Europe, and the Department wished to be able to respond effectively to inquiries about studies in progress in the United States.

At its meeting on December 4 the committee considered this request with reference to the lack of any single or unified list of research projects in the social sciences in this country. The several thousand projects under way, the decentralized character of research activities, and the difficulty and expense of keeping a list up to date, are among the reasons why no over-all research census has been undertaken. In the absence of such a list, the committee requested the staff to look into the availability of materials which might be useful to UNESCO.

As a result the Council has provided UNESCO with information about the operations of two large-scale inquiries financed by agencies of the federal government, and it has forwarded copies of representative publications describing research now being carried out in various disciplines of the social sciences, and of directories of research organizations.

A list of the publications sent to the Department of Social Sciences will be furnished upon request.

The two inquiries are those being administered by the American Council of Learned Societies and the Department of State, respectively. Under a contract with the Office of Naval Research, the American Council of Learned Societies is in the process of developing a national register of specialists in the humanities and social sciences. The *ACLS Newsletter* for November 1951 states that questionnaires are being sent to persons engaged in the following fields: aesthetics, anthropology, archaeology, demography, economics, geography, history, international law, languages and linguistics, musicology, philosophy and religion, political science, sociology, and statistics. The questionnaires request information about research topics and sources of financial support of research, and are expected to produce data on more than 20,000 individuals.

The External Research Staff of the Office of Intelligence Research, Department of State, is developing a consolidated catalog of nongovernment research in progress in the social sciences on foreign areas and international problems, excluding United States foreign policy. This catalog now contains about 2,500 items, and is open to consultation by students. *Research Lists*, Nos. 1-13, covering research in major world areas, have just been issued on the basis of this catalog. Information concerning research about this country's foreign policy may be obtained through the Division of Historical Policy Research, Office of Public Affairs, Department of State.

It is understood that the contents of the Department of

State catalog would be available to the Department of Social Sciences of UNESCO; and while no definite arrangements have been made about the availability of the relevant information from the ACLS questionnaires, it is hoped that the interests of UNESCO, as representative of social scientists in other countries, may be served to some extent in this connection.

INTERNATIONAL EXCHANGE OF PERSONS

(Appointed by the Conference Board of Associated Research Councils)

M. H. Trytten (chairman), Marland P. Billings, Francis J. Brown, Aaron J. Brumbaugh, Harold C. Deutsch, Mortimer Graves, Herbert J. Herring, C. Phillip Miller, Sidney Painter, William R. Parker, C. F. Voegelin, Bryce Wood; *staff*, Francis A. Young, executive secretary; Trusten W. Russell; Elizabeth Lam.

The committee is now accepting applications for awards under the Fulbright Act for university lecturing and advanced research for the academic year 1953-54 in Australia, New Zealand, the Philippines, Burma, Thailand, India, Pakistan, and Japan. In all these countries, with the exception of Pakistan, the academic year begins in the spring or early summer. Details regarding the specific opportunities available in each country are included in a printed announcement which can be obtained from the committee.

The announcement also includes information concerning approximately forty awards offered under the initial programs for Denmark, Iraq, and Japan. These awards are available for the academic year beginning in September 1952. Applications are also invited for approximately twelve awards still available for lecturing in Pakistan during the academic year beginning in October 1952.

Applications for the Pakistan program and for the interim programs for Denmark, Japan, and Iraq should be submitted as early as possible in view of the short time available for the selection of grantees. The closing date for mailing applications either for the interim programs or the regular East Asia and Pacific competition is April 15, 1952.

Awards are ordinarily made for one academic year, although in exceptional circumstances applications will be considered for periods of not less than six months. Awards for teaching or research usually include round-trip transportation for the grantee, a maintenance allowance including certain allowances for dependents, and a small supplemental allowance for travel and equipment purchasable abroad. Grants are made in the currency of the country to which the grantee is going and are not convertible into dollars.

Grantees in the lecturing category are subject to federal income tax on the proceeds of the award. It is hoped that as an assistance to visiting lecturers in meeting their dollar requirements, small supplemental grants in dollars will continue to be available from other funds appropriated for government exchange programs.

Applicants in the category of visiting lecturers should have teaching experience in an institution of higher learning in the United States. Applicants for research are ex-

pected to have the doctoral degree or equivalent professional standing. All applicants must be United States citizens.

Requests for detailed information and application forms should be addressed to the Executive Secretary, Committee on International Exchange of Persons, 2101 Constitution Avenue, Washington 25, D. C.

F. A. Y.

NEAR AND MIDDLE EAST

George G. Cameron (chairman), Carleton S. Coon, Douglas D. Crary, Peter G. Franck, Richard N. Frye, J. C. Hurewitz, Majid Khadduri, E. A. Speiser; *staff*, Bryce Wood.

At its meeting on January 26 the committee gave consideration to a revision of the research suggestions which it had prepared in the spring of 1951. Interest was expressed in a suggestion that the committee sponsor a small conference in the fall of the current year. The conference would center its attention on economic, social, and political problems of the contemporary Near East as viewed by various segments of the public in different countries in the area. One of the topics suggested was that of responses to technological developments on the part of local interest groups.

Field work in the Near East was extensively discussed with particular reference to its significant contributions to the training of area specialists. The experience of the University of Michigan's expedition to Iraq and Iran in 1951, which was directed by the chairman of the committee, was reviewed, and it was thought that means should be sought for the facilitation of field research on the part of scholars in the social sciences and related disciplines. A subcommittee was appointed to draft papers on the first two of these subjects for discussion at a meeting of the committee on March 14.

POLITICAL BEHAVIOR

V. O. Key (chairman), Conrad M. Arensberg, Angus Campbell, Alfred de Grazia, Oliver Garceau, Avery Leiserson, M. Brewster Smith, David B. Truman.

Although the committee is continuing its general exploration of the nature and limits of the political behavior approach, it is turning more of its attention to the applicability of the approach to particular fields and to particular projects. At its session in October the committee's guests, Merle Fainsod of Harvard University and William T. R. Fox of Columbia University, discussed types of analysis of the Soviet system and of international politics. At its December meeting the committee reviewed plans by Malcolm Moos of Johns Hopkins University for the experimental study of political leadership, examined with Oliver Garceau certain early phases of his study of group interaction, and reviewed a preliminary report prepared by Angus Campbell on party identification and public affairs. The committee devoted its January session to a detailed examination of plans for a study of the 1952 presidential election in the light of its earlier more general discussions of the analysis of political behavior. Sessions in the immediate

future are to be devoted to a testing of the committee's general approach in terms of particular problems raised by specific projects being undertaken by members of the committee and others.

V. O. K.

SLAVIC STUDIES

(Joint with the American Council of Learned Societies)

Merle Fainsod (chairman), Cyril E. Black (secretary), Abram Bergson, William B. Edgerton, H. H. Fisher, Waldemar Gurian, Ernest J. Simmons, René Wellek, Sergius Yakobson.

Under the auspices of the joint committee, a small group of scholars in the field of Soviet economics are being invited to meet on May 23-25, 1952. The conference, which is being organized under the chairmanship of Abram Bergson of Columbia University, will have as its theme "Soviet Economic Growth: Conditions and Perspectives." The chairman reports an enthusiastic response to the project from his colleagues. The participants will come from various universities and colleges, including the University of California at Berkeley, the University of Chicago, Columbia, Harvard, Johns Hopkins, and Swarthmore, and from the Rand Corporation and several government agencies.

It is planned to mimeograph and circulate beforehand the formal papers that are scheduled, and to assure in this way a maximum of time for informal discussion. Needless to say, no detailed blueprint of the future growth of the Soviet economy is anticipated, but it is hoped that an inventory of knowledge of the strategic factors in Russian growth, including resources, population and labor, investment and organization, will illuminate Russian strengths and weaknesses. At the same time the conference will serve to mark out for future research areas of ignorance on a vital theme. It is anticipated that the proceedings of the conference will ultimately be published.

M. F.

SOCIAL BEHAVIOR

Leonard S. Cottrell, Jr. (chairman), Leon Festinger, Horace M. Miner, Robert R. Sears, Robin M. Williams, Jr., staff, M. Brewster Smith.

Beginning last November the committee has sought to clarify its objectives and functions and within these definitions to initiate appropriate action. Since the committee has broad responsibilities for planning in the areas of interest roughly indicated by the disciplines of anthropology, social psychology, and sociology, a first task was to review the current work of the Council in order to avoid unnecessary duplication and to relate the new committee's efforts to what is already in process.

Discussions of current efforts and other specific topics which members of the committee felt merited attention soon made it evident that the committee would not favor merely adding to the list of specific problems for research planning. Nor did it favor undertaking a disembodied consideration of theory and method. There was early agreement that means should be sought to: (1) facilitate the identification

of strategic research problems; (2) stimulate the formulation of hypotheses and form a basis for judging the significance of present research; (3) encourage appropriate cross-disciplinary mobilization of resources in theory, method, and research skill; and (4) provide a concrete research focus of sufficient importance to encourage genuine interdisciplinary research training.

The means finally selected to accomplish these objectives was to confront the committee with the problem of designing a research program for the cross-cultural study of social behavior in a large number of cultures on which there is already available a substantial amount of good ethnographic material. The aim would not be an omnibus plan of descriptive fact-gathering, but systematic testing in a variety of contexts of hypotheses which social scientists would agree are of critical importance. Among the considerations which the committee felt favored a cross-cultural approach were:

- (a) The conditions and consequences of a greater range of variability can be studied than will be possible in any single society.
- (b) Within any single society there is the likelihood that the very deviance of behavior varying from the norm introduces a complicating factor. Cross-culturally it is possible to study variability among the modal behavior in the different cultures.
- (c) With an experimental approach, applied in a strategic sampling of the larger group of cultures, it should be possible to distinguish between humanly universal vs. culturally determined relationships.
- (d) Aside from the correlational study of the culturally modal behavior and cross-cultural experimental studies, there is a third possibility: detailed measurement of intracultural variability in a smaller selection of cultures.
- (e) The cross-cultural proposal provides a concrete focus for our consideration of most of the substantive problem areas in which the committee is interested.
- (f) It has major implications for research training, presumably leading to establishment of university centers in which interdisciplinary research teams would be trained.

The committee of course realizes that one research project involving the study of numerous cultures is beyond the resources which could realistically be invested in one project. However, it believes it is quite realistic in assuming that a well-developed research design will not only attract substantial support but will also make it possible for various separate research projects which involve cross-cultural investigations to include a part or all of the committee's designs in their plans. Having agreed on a general formula, the committee next undertook to identify a few substantive areas which contain critical problems of interest to social scientists and in which present theory and method are sufficiently developed to permit the formulation of fruitful hypotheses for testing in a variety of cultural situations. Three areas were so identified:

- (1) *Socialization.* The process by which the social system and its culture become incorporated in the reactive system of the individual, in the case of both the developing child

and the more mature individual moving from one social system to another, presents basic problems of theoretical and practical interest to all the behavioral disciplines.

(2) *Communication and the Processes of Interpersonal Influence*. Of central importance in the transmission of the culture and in integrating the behavior of collectivities are those processes by which meanings are shared and influence exerted. Here again is a focal area of critical scientific and practical significance for all concerned with social behavior.

(3) *Social Integration*. The question of what holds collectivities together and enables constituent individuals and groups to operate in a stable and integrated pattern through time and, on the other hand, what takes place in the disintegration of these systems, because of its central importance both practically and scientifically, make this area an obvious choice for the committee's attention.

Preliminary examination of these areas revealed that they contain distinctive problems but are interrelated sufficiently to promise a fruitful interaction of ideas.

Having defined the areas in which it wished to work, the committee proceeded to organize exploratory working conferences on each one. Two conferences were held in February and a third in March. Each conference group was asked to consider its assigned area with respect to the focal problems it presents, the relevant conceptualizations and variables, specific hypotheses which should be tested, and methods available and needed for research in that area.

On the basis of the work of these conferences the committee will determine the relative promise of the area and next steps for planning appropriate research should this promise warrant such activity.

L. S. C.

PERSONNEL

DIRECTORS OF THE COUNCIL

The seven national social science organizations associated with the Council have designated the following persons to serve as directors of the Council for the three-year term 1952-54:

Fred Eggan, University of Chicago, by the American Anthropological Association

George W. Stocking, Vanderbilt University, by the American Economic Association

Ray A. Billington, Northwestern University, by the American Historical Association

Schuyler C. Wallace, Columbia University, by the American Political Science Association

Douglas McGregor, Antioch College, by the American Psychological Association

Conrad Taeuber, Bureau of the Census, by the American Sociological Society

Mortimer Spiegelman, Metropolitan Life Insurance Company, by the American Statistical Association.

The American Historical Association has also designated Gordon A. Craig of Princeton University to fill the vacancy on the board of directors caused by the resignation of Elmer Ellis, whose term would have expired at the end of 1952. The credentials of the eight appointees are scheduled for acceptance by the board of directors of the Council at its spring meeting in New York on March 29-30, 1952.

PUBLICATIONS

SSRC BULLETINS AND MONOGRAPHS

Social Behavior and Personality: Contributions of W. I. Thomas to Theory and Social Research, edited by Edmund H. Volkart. June 1951. 348 pp. Cloth, \$3.00.

Support for Independent Scholarship and Research by Elbridge Sibley. Report of an inquiry jointly sponsored by the American Philosophical Society and the Social Science Research Council. May 1951. 131 pp. \$1.25.

Area Research: Theory and Practice, Bulletin 63, by Julian H. Steward. August 1950. 183 pp. \$1.50.

Culture Conflict and Crime, Bulletin 41, by Thorsten Sellin. 1938; reprinted September 1950. 116 pp. \$1.00.

Tensions Affecting International Understanding: A Survey of Research, Bulletin 62, by Otto Klineberg. May 1950. 238 pp. Paper, \$1.75; cloth, \$2.25.

DIRECTORY OF FELLOWS

Fellows of the Social Science Research Council 1925-1951. New York, 1951. 485 pp. Limited distribution. \$5.00.

All publications listed above are distributed from the New York office of the Council.

SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH COUNCIL

230 PARK AVENUE, NEW YORK 17, N. Y.

Incorporated in the State of Illinois, December 27, 1924, for the purpose of advancing research in the social sciences

Directors 1952: RALPH L. BEALS, WENDELL C. BENNETT, RAY A. BILLINGTON, GORDON A. CRAIG, J. FREDERIC DEWHURST, FRED EGGAN, CHARLES FAIRMAN, ROBERT B. HALL, PENDLETON HERRING, WILLARD HURST, HAROLD A. INNS, OTTO KLINEBERG, ALEXANDER LEIGHTON, DONALD G. MARQUIS, DOUGLAS MCGREGOR, LOWRY NELSON, ROY F. NICHOLS, FREDERICK OSBORN, DON K. PRICE, THEODORE W. SCHULIZ, ROBERT R. SEARS, MORTIMER SPIEGELMAN, GEORGE W. STOCKING, CONRAD TAEUBER, DOROTHY S. THOMAS, SCHUYLER C. WALLACE, S. S. WILKS, MALCOLM M. WILLEY, HOLBROOK WORKING, DONALD YOUNG

Officers and Staff: PENDLETON HERRING, *President*; PAUL WEBBINK, *Vice-President*; ELBRIDGE SIBLEY, *Executive Associate*; HAROLD E. JONES, *Pacific Coast Representative*; BRYCE WOOD; ELEANOR C. ISBELL; JOSEPH B. CASAGRANDE; M. BREWSTER SMITH; CAROLYN E. ALLEN, *Financial Secretary*